REMARKS

The Office Action dated October 17, 2008 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 15, 18-20, 22, 25, 32, 33, 37-40, 41, 44-46, 50 and 51 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. No new matter has been added and no new issues are raised which require further consideration or search. Claims 1-51 are currently pending in the present application and are respectfully submitted for reconsideration.

Claims 1-47 and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Chaney (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0108000). Although the introduction to this rejection indicated that claims 1-47 and 52 were rejected, claims 1-51 are the only claims that are currently pending and, therefore, Applicants will proceed under the assumption that the Office Action intended to reject claims 1-47 as being anticipated by Chaney. In particular, the Office Action took the position that Chaney discloses all of the elements of the claims. This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-18 are dependent, recites a method that includes receiving at least one registration request for registration of a user requesting a service in a network entity in an internet protocol multimedia core network subsystem of a communication system. The method further includes providing the network entity with control information indicating at least one limitation on a plurality of simultaneous registrations. The control information indicating a restriction on a number of different

contact addresses that can be simultaneously registered using a single public user identity. The method still further includes controlling the registration based on the control information.

Claim 19, upon which claims 20-31 are dependent, recites a system that includes a network entity configured to receive at least one request for registration of a user requesting a service in a network entity in an internet protocol multimedia core network subsystem. The system further includes a providing unit configured to provide the network entity with control information indicating at least one limitation on a plurality of simultaneous registrations. The control information indicating a restriction on a number of different contact addresses that can be simultaneously registered using a single public user identity. The system still further includes a controlling unit configured to control the registration based on the control information.

Claim 32, upon which claims 33-38 are dependent, recites an apparatus that includes receiving means for receiving at least one registration request for registration of users requesting a service in an internet protocol multimedia core network subsystem. The apparatus further includes receiving control means for receiving control information indicating at least one limitation on a plurality of simultaneous registrations. The control information indicating a restriction on a number of a different contact addresses that can be simultaneously registered using a single public user identity. The apparatus further includes controlling means for controlling the registration based on the control information.

Claim 39 recites an apparatus, upon which claims 40-44 are dependent, recites an apparatus that includes a receiver configured to receive at least one registration request for registration of a user requesting a service in an network entity in an internet protocol multimedia core network subsystem. The receiver is further configured to receive control information indicating at least one limitation on a plurality of simultaneous registrations. The control information indicating a restriction on a number of different contact addresses that can be simultaneously registered using a single public user identity. The apparatus further includes a controller configured to control the registration based on the control information.

As will be discussed below, the teachings of Chaney fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claims, and therefore fails to provide the features discussed above. The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Chaney discloses a system and method to provide a subscriber service to users in a telecommunications network. The service is provided to the user without the user having to know the network ID of the server providing the service. In operation a user-A utilizing a terminal-A 11 registers with the network, and a P-CSCF 13 determines the home network 14 associated with the originating user and performs authentication and verification with the home network. The user-A may establish communications with another user-B via using session initiation protocol signaling (SIP).

In one example, a conference server may initiate communication with a plurality of users via a conference call that uses SIP signaling. FIG. 7B illustrates a flow diagram that illustrates the process of establishing a conference. One user, in particular, may be

established as an "owner" who controls the conference by determining which users will be invited as participants. The owner may decide which users may be invited, for example, to a quiz game, and the conference server will perform those operations specified by the owner (see operations 145-147 of FIG 7B). The participants may all be registered to a single service (i.e., the quiz game), however, those participants are registered within the service as separate subscribers (see paragraph [0074] of Chaney). That is, the contract addresses of the users are not sharing a same single public user identity and are playing the quiz game as individual subscribers who are subscribing to the same service through their own subscriptions.

Chaney fails to disclose or suggest "providing the network entity with control information indicating at least one limitation on a plurality of simultaneous registrations, said control information indicating a restriction on a number of different contact addresses that can be simultaneously registered using a single public user identity", as recited, in part, in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claims 19, 32 and 39.

Applicants submit that the "service" disclosed in Chaney is not comparable to the "single public user identity" of the plurality of contact addresses. The service is the actual thing that is subscribed to by the users in their individual capacities as subscribers. The top of paragraph [0075] of Chaney discloses that "Players who are interested in quiz games may subscribe to a quiz game service at step 121...At step 123, the players subscribing to the quiz game service are notified by the PIM server. Additionally, paragraph [0076] discloses that the game server is aware of members on other CSCFs...If

the game server needs to verify their presence state...it can send a reciprocating subscriber message to the home domain of each player (emphasis added). Nowhere does Chaney disclose one single public user identity being used by a plurality of different contact addresses. Therefore, it is clear that the players subscribe to the service in their individual capacities as subscribers having their own subscriptions as opposed to a single public user identity used to represent more than one player or user.

Chaney further fails to disclose "different contact addresses can be simultaneously registered under a single public user identity", as recited, in part, in independent claims 1, 19, 32 and 39. Chaney does not disclose using any type of public user identity. Chaney further fails to disclose any single identity that is used to represent a plurality of simultaneously registered contact addresses. Chaney discloses multiple examples of individual user terminals registering individually with a network, none of which involve registering more than one contact address simultaneously and certainly not multiple different contact addresses being registered under a single public user identity.

Referring to FIG. 2 of Chaney, a first terminal "Terminal-A 11" sends its own register message 31 to the P-CSCF 13 (see paragraph [0029] of Chaney). Terminal-A is associated only with User-A's profile (see paragraph [0030] of Chaney). Additionally, "Terminal-B 12" sends its own register message 38 to the terminating P-CSCF 26, which is also associated with a single user (User-B) profile (see paragraph [0031] of Chaney). The only way multiple users become involved in a single application is by first having a requesting user send a plurality of refer messages to the PIM server to invite other parties to a common conference call (see paragraph [0042] of Chaney). Regardless of this

multiple user conference call, each user must individually join the conference call once invited (see paragraph [0043] of Chaney, step 84 of FIG. 3B).

Chaney's single user service participation model is further evidenced by the subject matter recited in claim 1. As may be clearly observed from the third operation of claim 1 of Chaney (See page 7 of Chaney), an identity of the service provider is sent from the presence server to the plurality of service users. In other words, the subscribing of users to a service is performed by treating each of the users as individuals who subscribe separately. There is no disclosure of any public user identity being used to represent a plurality of contact addresses that are registered for a particular service.

Therefore, Applicants submit that Chaney fails to teach all of the subject matter of independent claims 1, 19, 32 and 39. By virtue of dependency, Chaney also fails to teach the subject matter of dependent claims 2-18, 20-31, 33-38 and 40-51. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-47 is kindly requested.

Claims 48-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chaney in view of Herrero (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0009520). The Office Action took the position that Chaney discloses all of the elements of the claims, with the exception of at least one private user identity is registered with the network entity as representing a subscriber. The Office Action then cited Herrero as allegedly curing this deficiency in Chaney. This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Chaney is discussed above. Herrero is generally directed to a method and system for handling multiple registrations. Herrero, at paragraph [0072] provides an allegedly

simplified signaling flow of a registration process. The process begins with a user sending a registration request, along the way the system checks to see if the user is already registered (see paragraph [0078]), and, if not, eventually registers the user (See paragraph [0081]).

Claim 48-51 are dependent upon claims 1 and 39 and contain all of the limitations thereof. As discussed above, the teachings of Chaney fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claims 1 and 39. In addition, Herrero fails to cure the deficiencies in Chaney as Herrero also fails to disclose or suggest "different contact addresses that can be simultaneously registered under a single public user identity", as recited, in part, in independent claims 1, 19, 32 and 39. Thus, the combination of Chaney and Herrero fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claim 48-51. Furthermore, claim 48-51 should be allowed for at least their dependence upon claims 1 and 39, and for the specific limitations recited therein.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention. These distinctions are more than sufficient to render the claimed invention unanticipated and unobvious. It is therefore respectfully requested that all of claims 1-51 be allowed, and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicants' undersigned representative at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,

Kamran Emdadi
Registration No. 58,823

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-6212
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

KE/sjm